

TS-EAS - EAC-CPF team

Place:

Grand Salon 4, JW Marriott Austin, Austin, TX

Date:

Thursday, 1 August 2019, 9am - 5pm

Minutes:

Ailie Smith, Kathy Wisser

Participants:

Name	Institution	Role
Ailie Smith	University of Melbourne, Australia	
Katherine M. Wisser	Simmons University, USA	TS-EAS Co-Chair, Liaison
Karin Bredenberg	Riksarkivet, Sweden	TS-EAS Co-Chair
Kerstin Arnold	Archives Portal Europe Foundation, EU	Shared Schema team lead
Mark Custer	Yale University Library, USA	Schema team lead
Silke Jagodzinski	Bundesarchiv, Germany	EAC team lead

Agenda

1. Introduction (Silke)
2. Topic: Names (Silke)
3. Topic: Dates (Ailie)
4. Assertion Description (Mark)
5. Identifiers (Kathy)
6. Discussion (all)
7. Epilogue

1. Introduction

Aaron sent his regrets, he can't be with us. Adjustment to the agenda because we don't have a sense of Aaron's part; Gerhard also communicated that he would like to discuss the relations in Berlin. One hour more on discussion, including some things from Regine's group Relations to other Standards and Kerstin's group Shared Schema.

Where we are with the revision process: We started with the minor update, released in December 2018, and now we are in the middle of the major overhaul. Main revision process of the schema by summer 2020; some question about time table. Shared schema work needs to be figured in. More realistic to have the target to get out the revised schema in 2020 but take the time to get the feedback and incorporate it into the schema before releases in 2021.

Community feedback of current revision, up to now, is in GitHub. Issues of EAD3 reconciliation need a decision on how to handle that.

Clear idea of shared schema and how other standards might fit into that; Archives Portal Europe looking at a more complete revision. Based on EAC, so some alignment will be desirable down the line.

Would like to come out with some decisions on these topics; at least one hour for each issue, topic; and then prepare the final revision meeting in March meeting 2020.

2. Topic: Names

See [paper](#) and [slides](#) on Topic: Names

Nothing to see that is needed to change in a way to add that is about the names.

People are able to encode names in current schema, but they are not able to encode the **status of the name** or to encode the **rule** that is applied to the name. Need to encode **the source of the rule** of the name and the **source** of the name.

ISAAR provides 4 different forms of names: authorised name, parallel form of name, standardised forms of names, other forms of names.

User requests regarding EAC-CPF want to **qualify authorized** and **alternative** forms of names, need to qualify the **preferred form** of name:

- Encode the rules,
- Identify the institution who applied the rules,
- Encode the source of the name.

2.1. Name Entry Parallel

<nameEntryParallel> relates to very specific cataloguing rules in United States, eg the same title in different languages. In Europe, a parallel name might be another, equal name that is used synonymically at the same time, eg abbreviations. In this interpretation, there is no need that all names have the same status as authorised or alternative.

Proposal: Suggested change *<nameEntryEquivalent>* to bundle together sets of same name, identify one as authorised and rest as alternate. Could include *@type="parallel"* to reflect US usage. Use *@localType* to indicate what kind of parallel name is used (former, translation etc.)
→ to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Suggestion that we include best practice guide within or alongside tag library to explain usage of elements such as names and dates. → **agreed.**

Best Practice Chapter, guide to propose use.

Good place to explain the distinction between a parallel name entry and an equivalent name entry.

Use cases for complex, ambiguous encoding with description, including encoding examples.

Connections/links from the tag library to the element/attribute to the according paragraph.

2.2. Rules

Names need to be authorised by someone/a rule. Preference to use attributes for encoding rules, rather than elements to be more flexible.

Proposal: Use EAD3 attribute *@rules* within *<nameEntry>* to encode the rules. Use existing element *<conventionDeclaration>* to describe the rules. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Suggestion re-use existing elements *<agencyCode>* and *<agencyName>* within *<conventionDeclaration>* to describe and identify the rules source. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Use *@id* attribute to *<conventionDeclaration>* to provide an option for direct link between described rule and *@rules* attribute. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Add *@idref* to *<nameEntry>* to link a name entry to a rules description. → to be discussed within revision

2.3. Status

Name can have following status: authorized, alternative, preferred.

Definitely agreed that this cannot happen:

```
<nameEntry status="authorized; alternative" rule="AFNOR; RDA">
```

Proposal: Add new optional attribute *@status* with closed list to indicate if a name is authorized or alternative. Question which values to use for the attribute: binary question or a question that has more than two attributes. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Use *@normal* in the context of EAD3 *<persname>*, *<corpname>*, *<famname>* to enter the authorized, normalized Form of name. *<nameEntry normal="[authorized version]"><part>IIDH</part></nameEntry>*, authorized form would not use *@normal* attribute. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Turn element *<preferredForm>* into an attribute without running into issues with repeatability:

- *@preferredForm="yes"* or *"no"* or

- @preferred="yes" or "no" or
- EAD 3 attribute @value (EAD attribute).

→ to be discussed within revision

Only the proposal to include a best practice guide within or alongside tag library was decided.

Silke is going to rework the paper Topic: Names with the proposals to facilitate a decision.

3. Topic: Dates

see [paper](#) on Topic:Dates

3.1. Uncertain dates

Best practice for describing uncertain dates, there is not really a way to do that at the moment. EAC-CPF date schemas have been imported into EAD3 schema. <date> and <datesingle> in EAD3 have different contexts.

Proposal: Use [EDTE](#), integrated in ISO 8601-2019, to qualify a date as "uncertain", "approximate" and "uncertain and approximate". Seems to be functional and syntactically consistent. → **agreed**

Question: Would that solution need to require @standarddate? → Only if you wanted it to be structured.

Proposal: Add EAD3 attribute @certainty for alignment? → **agreed**

Proposal: In the context of discussions about more closely aligning EAC-CPF and EAD, consider the names of the date elements and whether to recommend EAD includes the @certainty, @notafter and @notbefore attributes across all of their date elements. → to be discussed within revision

3.2. Unknown end dates

Using element <dateRange> and have incomplete dates, like unknown dates or on-going timespan. There is a disconnection between tag library and schema. You can now have dateRanges that are incomplete?

Best practice Archives Portal Europe: <existDates> is mandatory, using @localType on date or <dateRange>, that allows you to include known-status information; always include the elements but leave empty those that are unknown and always on the <dateRange>.

Proposal: Enable the possibility to differentiate between unknown and on-going dates. → **agreed**

Proposal: Use new attribute @status to indicate unknown or open dates. Need to be really clear about the distinction between @status and @value. → **agreed**

No need to rework paper on Topic:Dates.

4. Assertion Description

see [paper](#) Topic: Assertion Control, see also [source document](#)

There is only one [feature request](#), coming from [SNAC](#).

People are not able to encode information on sources for detailed information or data in an EAC-CPF document. Solution should accommodate supplementary metadata to cite sources that provide support for why particular assertions exist in the EAC-CPF record.

4.1. Proposal

Six extra data points to be able to help SNAC link up different data points; Wim suggested to put all of this in a descriptive note; works with conflicting information

See use cases, there is an appearance of conflicting data, eg appearance of names that appear only once in a publication, not acknowledged.

An assertion can apply to EAD, eg user contributions to finding aids.

Proposal: Introduce a new element <evidence> to be connected with existing element <source> and <maintenanceEvent>. → to be discussed within revision

Maintenance event points to the source (its addition); source doesn't point to the maintenance event. Where the evidence is stated needs to be in the evidence.

Simplify the model a little to be clear about what you pointing to where. Relate source to <maintenanceEvent>, don't include <maintenanceEvent> in assertion.

Prefer not to name element <evidence> – we need to come up with less loaded term. Use word “assertion” in tag library to refer to data which we might be providing evidence of assertions?

Proposal: Introduce a new attribute @fromSource to link to the element <source>, ie this evidence is based on information in this source. → **agreed**

Examination of <source> structure is need. Make recommendations (at the least) of full citations for sources so the connection between the evidence and citation can be followed.

Proposal: Introduce a new attribute @supportsAssertion to specify the exact data element. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Introduce a new attribute @associatedMaintenanceEvent to associate an agent/date/note. → **declined**

Proposal: Introduce a new element <citedRange> with EAD3 attribute @unit to specify where the cited range of materials represents a page number, volume number, etc. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Introduce a new element <foundData> to indicate why a new element name is suggested rather than repurposing something like <descriptiveNote>. → to be discussed within revision

Proposal: Introduce a new attribute @assertionRank, added to a parent element of <evidence> that can be used when assertions of the same type contradict. → to be discussed within revision

Counterproposal: Use the new attribute @status to indicate the ranking.

Proposal: Introduce a new attribute @relatedAssertion, added to a parent element of <evidence> that can be used when assertions of the same type contradict. → to be discussed within revision

Agreed on the basic model of this approach but needs a little refinement.

Be careful of language -- e.g., evidence, assertion, etc.; reliance on the xml:id.

Mark is going to rework the paper Topic: Assertion description with the proposals to facilitate a decision.

AOB: reuse examples of <nameEntry><part> that include name parts for tag library.

5. Identifiers

see [paper](#) Topic: Identifiers

5.1. Types of identifiers

There are 3 types of identifiers:

1. Identifier Type 1: database primary key, unambiguous reference in a local context,
 - <recordID>: IDs associated with THIS record
 - <otherRecordId>: IDs associated with THIS record
 - refers to an identifier such as a previous <recordID> for the same record, not ID for another record for same entity;
 - identification of other instances
 - is always a result of aggregation.
 - <cpfRelation type="identity">: a good place for record from another system
 - linking to other records that describe the same entity
 - authority record as source, would duplicate it as <cpfRelation> identity
 - <source> is a good place for record from another system
2. Identifier Type 2. Informational identifiers that distinguish and determine entities – not records,
 - E.g. <nameEntry>
3. Identifier Type 2. Non-informational, unique identifier for an entity, not a primary key.
 - ORCID ID is an example of <entityID>
 - E.g. ISNI
4. Identifier Type 3. - unique locations within an XML instance
 - METS is quite sophisticated use of internal (type 3) identifiers

Need to clarify which EAC-CPF identifiers are each type, clarify types and usages in tag library.

5.2. Definition of <otherRecordId>

[Issue 54](#) : Are we ok with using @localType for identifying more info around <otherRecordId>?

Do we need another attribute?

eg @agencyCode> or rather @agencyIdentifier> constrained to ISIL: ISO 15511, to identify where <otherRecordId> comes from. We need to avoid having element and attribute with same name containing same data.

Add @agencyCode (can't be the same name as an element; @agencyIdentifier) as an additional attribute to otherRecordId to make it clear where the otherRecordId came from.

How to reference other records in other systems related to the same entity (not versions of same record) without using <cpfRelation>?

Proposal: A Source is implied by most of these elements, can be duplicated in <sources>. This approach places more importance on sources than previously, we might need to work on sources to be able to encode source more completely. Use element <source> for identifiers of merged, translated records, authority files. → **agreed**

Source can be from relations section, from <otherRecordId>, could be something different

Add an @authorityFileNumber attribute? @authfileno; primary key in another system accommodate in source,

Source can pick up on both variations; but it can also be something that is not referenced by either otherRecordId or cpfRelation. Sources as a combination but also other sources of information.

The only duplication would be in the source portion; implicit sources in cpfRelation and otherRecordId

Need to add some granularity to source to make it more granular

5.3. Quality of <agencyCode>

[Issue 15](#): Add attributes @localType or @status to <agencyCode>- ISO5511 – to specify that it is following the standard but can't specify that it is a registered agency code. Use attributes @status or @rule to document this. → to be discussed within revision

5.4. Definition of <entityId>

[Issue 55](#): Should <entityId> be renamed <identityId>? More accurate name for element. → **agreed**

<entityId> = <identityId>, example of different descriptions should be in cpfRelation not in entityId.

Final encoding and definition for Tag Library and Application Guidelines to be defined. Also an [document on identifiers](#) by Shared Schema team, needs to be reviewed for identifiers definition during the revision process.

6. Epilogue

Ailie volunteered to edit EAC-CPF tag library. She becomes the new TL editor and succeeds Erica.

Kerstin volunteered to update website information with a short article/report on this meeting.

Silke is going to update Github and includes a new folder for today's meeting.

Monthly meetings are working well. Consider changing the way we deal with issue of the month.

Assign issue to someone to introduce the topic, discuss, then decide on issue the following month.

6.1. Proposals

No	Proposal	Decision	Issue no
1	Suggested change <i><nameEntryEquivalent></i> to bundle together sets of same name, identify one as authorised and rest as alternate. Could include @type="parallel" to reflect US usage.	to be discussed within revision	#66
2	Suggestion that we include best practice guide within or alongside tag library to explain usage of elements such as names and dates.	agreed	
3	Suggestion use existing elements <agencyCode> and <agencyName> within <conventionDeclaration> to describe and identify rules and the rules source.	to be discussed within revision	#67
4	Use EAD3 attribute @rules within <nameEntry> to encode the rules. Use existing element <conventionDeclaration> to describe the rules.	to be discussed within revision	#68
5	Add @idref to <nameEntry> to link a name entry to a rules description.	to be discussed within revision	#69
6	Use @id attribute to <conventionDeclaration> to provide an option for direct link between described rule and @rules attribute.	to be discussed within revision	#67
7	Use @normal in the context of EAD3 <persname>, <corpname>, <famname> to enter the authorized, normalized Form of name.	to be discussed within revision	#72
8	Add new optional attribute @status with closed list to indicate if a name is authorized or alternative. Question which values to use for the attribute: binary question or a question that has more than two attributes.	to be discussed within revision, see also below	#70
9	Turn element <preferredForm> into an attribute without running into issues with repeatability: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• @preferredForm="yes" or "no" or• @preferred="yes" or "no" or• EAD 3 attribute @value (EAD attribute).	to be discussed within revision	#71
10	Enable the possibility to differentiate between unknown and on-going dates.	agreed	see #70
11	Use new attribute @status to indicate unknown or open dates.	agreed	#70
	Add new optional attribute @certainty to encode the level of confidence for a date.	agreed	#75
12	Add a new element <evidence> to be connected with existing elements <source> and <maintenanceEvent>.	to be discussed within revision; new	#73

		element agreed, but name to be discussed	
13	Add a new attribute @fromSource to link to the element <source>, ie this evidence is based on information in this source.	agreed	#73
14	Add a new attribute @supportsAssertion to specify the exact data element.	to be discussed within revision	#73
15	Add new element <citedRange> with attribute @unit to specify where the cited range of materials represents a page number, volume number, etc.	to be discussed within revision	#73
16	Add a new element <foundData> to indicate why a new assertion is suggested.	to be discussed within revision	#73
17	Add new attribute @assertionRank, added to a parent element of <evidence> that can be used when assertions of the same type contradict or use attribute @status.	to be discussed within revision	#70
18	Add new attribute @relatedAssertion, added to a parent element of <evidence> that can be used when assertions of the same type contradict.	to be discussed within revision	#74
19	Use element <source> for identifiers of merged, translated records, authority files.	Agreed	no issue yet
20	Add attributes @localType or @status to <agencyCode> to specify that it is following the standard.	to be discussed within revision	#70
21	Use attributes @status or @rules to specify that it is a registered agency code.	to be discussed within revision	#70
22	Rename <entityID> in <identityID>	agreed	#55

6.2. Tasks

No	Task	Responsibility
1	Rework the paper Topic: Names with the proposals to facilitate a decision	Silke
2	Rework the paper Topic: Assertion description with the proposals to facilitate a decision.	Mark
3	Final encoding and definition for identifiers for Tag Library and Application Guidelines.	
4	Review document on identifiers for identifiers definition during the revision process.	Kathy
5	Article/report on Austin meeting for website	Kerstin
6	Update Github issues and documents	Silke